

Cancel Claims 2 and 3 without prejudice.

Amend Claim 4 as follows:

4. (Amended) An armature for a rotating machine as set forth in claim 1, wherein the insulator portions have a greater thickness than the insulating bobbin leg portions.

Amend Claim 5 as follows:

5. (Amended) An armature for a rotating machine as set forth in claim 1, wherein the insulator portions define an open slot that receives the winding nozzle tip.

Amend Claim 6 as follows:

6. (Amended) An armature for a rotating machine as set forth in claim 5, wherein the open slot is formed between portions of the insulator portions that define an opening smaller than the diameter of the received winding nozzle tip.

Cancel Claims 7 through 14 without prejudice.

REMARKS

The claims have been amended rather extensively so as to clearly define over the structure shown in the Uchida et al reference. The Examiner has not specifically indicated which figure of this reference he is relying on, but it is clear that the reference is primarily directed toward the provision of a further insulators that are positioned in each slot and which insulators define a closed opening through which the coil winding is placed. This is a very cumbersome and unsatisfactory way of solving the problem.

In addition, it actually does not protect the wire as well as the needle while the winding operation takes place. The claims, therefore, been amended so as to clearly call for the fact that the bobbin is the member that forms the protecting insulation that extends along the projecting ends of the teeth that face inwardly of the slot and toward the circular portion of the core.

Also the Examiner's comments regarding the relationship to the winding needle not being given significance have been noted, it is believed that it is not proper to ignore a limitation that is clearly brought out in the claims and specifically those dealing with the slot that receives the winding nozzle tip and the relationship of that slot to the tip.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that the claim language clearly and patentably distinguishes over this reference.